

D1.2 Q4I Review Integration Seminar

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. 1 st Seminar, 27/9/2013 Barcelona	3
3. 2 nd Seminar, 25/10/2013 Lisbon	5
4. 3 rd Seminar, 5/11/2013 Athens	13

1. Introduction

Research was done to identify and analyse models of institutional development support in schools that have proven to be successful in instilling innovation in the school through quality development. The analysis covers 10 European countries: Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, UK. The report proposes a scope and research approach and questions to be addressed.

Research was divided among the partners according to geographic areas (taking into account language skills and local knowledge). Research focused on:

- The situation of schools regarding the "4 engines of change" (see the "Relevance" paragraphs of the proposal) in schools: mapping quantitative and qualitative data.
- Policies: identifying policies (local, regional, national, supranational) targeting the "4 engines" in EU Schools.
- Past and current initiatives and projects in EU Schools: mapping initiatives and projects targeting or including aspects considered innovative. Especially EU co-funded projects under the LLP Programme will be researched. Sources from other international actors like OECD, UN, Council of Europe will be taken into account.

Three Seminars were organised in Barcelona, Lisbon and Athens involving project partners and members of the Institutional Review Group and various stakeholders. The events had a practical nature, with short cases presentations and discussions on how to improve the Synthesis Report in terms of usability and impact. The events represent the first engagement moment of the Institutional Review Group, that will play a role also for the project dissemination and exploitation.

2. 1st Seminar, 27/9/2013 Barcelona

The first Q4I seminar was organised during the EFQUEL Innovation Forum in Barcelona on 27th September 2013.

The background of the 18 participants was:

- Researchers technology-enhanced learning
- Higher education mid management, E-learning Centers
- Management of schools

The Q4I representatives presented the aims and objectives of the project, the first findings of the research carried out and the Q4I manifesto.

The seminar followed the following outline:

What	Details	Time + Material
Live positioning ALL	Are you actively involved in quality development	'5 Yes/Si No prints
Manifesto critic GROUPS	Discuss + rate sentences in small groups	'20 Sentences on material
Q4I model presented ALL		'5 + '5 questions Handouts? Slides
Mind game GROUPS	How could you shape Q4I now? Pilot school Promotion/Tell everyone Learning Community/Criticise feedback Other How could you imagine your involvement in the future? Active network member, EFQUEL SIG leader Learning Community/Criticise feedback Other	'10 min Flipchart Printed options (left)

Participants were divided into groups and discussed the various points that were presented.

Key competences as creativity and innovation are currently [not, little, only partially, sufficiently] targeted by quality development at the school level.

Innovative activities by teachers, school leaders and administrative staff tend to be ill defined and their achievement is poorly tracked and reported; not part of quality processes.

Existing approaches towards quality development are perceived to hinder innovation NOT to stimulate it.

To trigger/drive/guide school innovation....

... Quality objectives should be developed building a consensus among all stakeholders also including

- innovators AND actors with traditional views and practices
- Business/industry

Quality development should

- not be cumbersome
- be a pleasant activity, not too burdened by procedural constraints
- Be an interactive procedure, activating the team's spirit towards change
- be close to daily practice in schools

ICT should play a facilitating role both

- To ease exchange/dialogue between schools
- To support quality processes

Identifying “quality gaps” collaboratively (stakeholders) should be the starting point of ownership of quality development.

3. 2nd Seminar, 25/10/2013 Lisbon

The second Q4I seminar was organised during the European School Heads Association General Assembly in Lisbon on 25th October 2013.

The ESHA General Assembly in October 2013 consisted of 39 representatives of national school heads associations (mostly their presidents), 5 ESHA staff persons and the minister of education from Serbia.

The group discussed the following:

- Why do innovative projects fail?
- Apply the learnings to the Q4I model
- Identify the most important assessment questions

The report about the ESHA General Assembly has been integrated with the report: Delivery 3.1 recommendations

File specific recommendations:

ESHA recommends to implement the following changes:

1 Introduction:

Change the second sentence into: ***Q4I is a project that aims to develop a quality management model for innovative schools that ensures high quality education while innovating educational practices***

2: The Q4I model:

ESHA advises to further develop the model. This model is too generic to be used in schools. ESHA advises, in line with earlier comments on the developed model, to....

A: ...integrate and differentiate the following hierarchic processes in the model:

1. External processes (engines of change, governors guidelines, policy maker regulations, parental concerns, assessments guide lines, etc) → Out side – in focus always first.
2. Management processes (strategy, management development, leadership practices)
3. Core education (pedagogic or classroom) processes and core pedagogic conditions

B: ... include interactive elements in the model. EG: possibilities to focus on an element of the model with automatic display of details described in the initial model described in the application. (two levels of details)

The Q4I has also identified the following 6 areas of change:

1. Innovation Process

2. Leadership
3. Strategy Development
4. Community involvement
5. Key Performance Indicators
6. Assessment, Monitoring and Improvement

ESHA believes that there is a certain randomness in these areas. Some areas should be grouped (4,5,6 are part of change management) 2 is conditional for 1, 3 is conditional to 2.

The usual areas of change in schools are: vision, strategy, planning, implementation and feedback

3 The piloting process.

This chapter start with the processes that teachers should go through. In the second phase of the chapter, the process is described. This chapter lacks an introduction. Describing the teacher oriented processes seems out of place. ESHA proposes the following paragraphs:

- a. Introduction
- b. Scheme + description
- c. Example for the teachers oriented processes

According to the advice outlined in the below chapter, ESHA strongly believes that every pilot project should start with describing the conditions for innovations. Are the conditions suitable for innovations or should the conditions be improved.

EG: One cannot innovate class room practise if the majority of teachers feel overburdened, unless the innovation decreases the work load”

General feedback (report and conclusions GA ESHA members October 2013)

ESHA advises the Q4I project team to include the that are described in part 2a in the “Q4I Guidelines for Piloting”. These steps should be included in the project phases and the initial questionnaire.

ESHA strongly believes that:

- Educational innovation should ultimately take place in the class room (actual or virtual)
- Classroom practices can only be innovated if the conditions are optimal for change.
- It is the main tasks of the Q4I project to address these conditions before educational processes can be changed.

ESHA advises that every change project should include the following hierarchic steps. ESHA refers to these steps as the “phases of readiness”.

1. Describe the playing field of the school. → External factors.

- engines of change,
- governors guidelines,
- policy maker regulations,
- parental concerns,
- assessments guide lines,

2. Management processes → managerial processes

- Strategy plan
- Management development,
- Leadership practices
- Organisation and sourcing

3. Core education → pedagogic or classroom processes

- Current pedagogical processes
- Empowerment of teachers
 - Teacher evaluation: skills / feedback
 - Define show stoppers
 - Training plan and budget
 - Teacher sourcing
- Pedagogic sourcing
 - Budgets etc

4. Innovation of educational processes

There steps (the phases of readiness) are hierarchic and conditional. This means that a school can only go to the next step if the former step are made. The key to successful innovation projects is to enable change before implementing change at the class room level.

Assessment feedback:

A good assessment is vital in every innovation project. The assessment is linked to the stages of readiness and it should indicate the readiness for innovation.

In addition to the questions that have been formulated in delivery 3.1, ESHA proposes to include the following questions according to the identified phases of readiness.

Readiness phase 1: Describe the playing field of the school. → External factors.

Every school is part of an ecosystem that has high demands of the school. Many stake holders have different objectives, guide lines, rules, wishes, etc. No matter how important these external actors are to the school, every school should recognize that the learner is the most important stakeholder to the school. Every school should put the learner at the centre of all its activities.

A: External factors

Does the management and the teachers have a good understanding of:

- the engines of change,
- governors guidelines,
- labour market demand and developments,
- technological (ICT) developments
- policy maker regulations,
- parental concerns and
- assessments guide lines?

Are these factors formally described in the strategy plan?

B: Learner orientation

Does the school put the learner at the centre of its strategy and classroom activities?

Please describe how this has been implemented.

C: Emotional well being

Does the school recognize the importance of emotional well being of students?

Does the school recognize that emotional well being is a main factor in school?

How is emotional well being described as a learning goal?

How is emotional well being implemented in the daily class room activities?

D: Assessments

How does the school perform in formal assessments?

E: Critical issues

Are there any critical problem the school is facing that requires a long term approach with regards to:

- Well being of learners; do learners have fun at school, do they believe school is a great place to be, are there frequent reports of bullying, violence, theft, etc
- Well being of teachers; are teachers up to the job, do they need assistance, do they feel overworked, do they enjoy teaching
- The atmosphere at school. Is there a learning oriented culture with room for experimenting and failure?
- Is the management capable to manage innovation projects?
- Are there any other urgent issues?

F: Experience with innovative projects

Does the school have experience with innovative projects that effected the learners?
(which)

What was the outcome of these projects / programs?

Were there any factors identified that negatively influenced the project / program?

Readiness phase 2: Management processes

A: One mission

does the school have a specific, general mission that the school would like to achieve
in 4/5 years time?

Please describe this mission

B: Strategy planning

Does the school have a strategy plan for the next 4/5 years?

Are the mission and goals clearly defined and measureable?

Does the school have yearly activity plans?

Are these plans in line with the strategy plan?

Does the school have a change management or project management approach?

How are results measured and compared with the targets/ objectives?

Is the school management connected with other school leaders?

Is the school and its strategy plan reviewed by peers?

C: Management development

Is the school management reviewed annually?

Do all school managers have a personal development plans?

How is the school head reviewed?

What is the influence of teachers on management decision?

D: Staff evaluation and development

Does the management plan yearly review discussions?

How are teachers rewarded for above average performance?

Are teachers sanctioned for below average performance?

Can learners influence the rating of teachers?

Do all teachers have personal development plans?

Does the school offer teachers training for professional and personal development?

Does the school have a counsellor for incidents?

E: Management style

What kind of management style is used at the school?

Does the management believe and practice distributed leadership?

F: Organization

How is the school formally organized?

Who are the main decision makers within the school?

Who are the most influential teachers (informal leadership)?

Who are the most positive of them?

Who will most probably be negative about change?

G: Management models

Does the management currently use quality management models?

Does the school have a quality manager?

How is quality management implemented in school?

Are all processes formally described?

H: Capacity and quality

Is the school facing a capacity problem?

Does the school have high quality teachers?

Do many teachers feel overburdened?

Is the school facing significant budget cuts?

How can the financial position of the school be described?

Readiness phase 3: Core education (pedagogic or classroom) processes and conditions

A: Classroom practices

Please describe the class room practices in general.

How are class rooms organised?

Are desks grouped together to enable group work?

Are the desk individually placed and faced towards the teacher?

B: New approaches to pedagogy

Has the school implemented new, innovative pedagogical approaches?

Does the school know the 21st century skills?

Are these skills perceived and described as main learning objectives?

How are these learning objectives implemented in the classroom?

What are the experience of the teachers and learners with these programs?

C: internet

Does the school offer internet access to students?

Does the school offer internet access during class room activities?

Is the internet perceived as a main information source during regular classes?

Are internet and internet applications integrated in regular curriculum?

D: ICT infrastructure

Does the school offer handheld computers to students?

Are pc's and handhelds an integral part of the curriculum?

Do students work in groups and how is the internet used in group assignments?

Does the school have agreements with internet application providers?

Does the school safeguard personal data of students?

Does the school shield learners from commercial activities from internet application/service providers?

E: Organisation of classes:

Do teachers integrate different subjects / classes? (vertical integration)

Are classes divided by age or knowledge? (horizontal integration)

Do teachers challenge learners with open ended assignments?

Do teachers use experts classes / lectures available on the internet?

4 The actual innovation process

The actual innovation processes are well described in the document.

4. 3rd Seminar, 5/11/2013 Athens

The third Q4I seminar was organised during the we.learn.it school workshop in Athens on 5th November 2013. The 15 participants were representatives of research organisations: the Institute of Education, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the Aalto University, the Stockholm University, Intel, the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation and the Hellenic Association for Education. The Q4I representatives presented the aims and objectives of the project, the first findings of the research carried out and the Q4I manifesto. Participants were divided into groups, discussed the various points that were presented and agreed on the following:

Any “top down only” approach to change in school education is deemed to produce limited results because commitment to change implies ownership of the process of transformation. Thus, **commitment to change must come from the participation of all internal and external stakeholders of school education** in all phases of change, from definition of aims to evaluation of results: innovation cannot be imposed, it has to be adopted.

Quality assurance approaches mediated from industry include a constant tension to improvement and change, but in the majority of cases in which they were applied to the education sector they certainly produced improvements in the transparency of the teaching and organisation process, but were not adopted by the majority of the educational community as really relevant to the quality of education. Q4I proposes to **combine quality assurance with innovation in a way that respects and builds on the specificity of school education.**

Learning from each other is a core principle of innovation in the school systems, and cross-country learning communities can help to recognise similarities and specificities of local/national contexts, and thus to enrich innovation plans of each school participating in the mutual learning programmes.

Learning and innovation skills are what separate students who are prepared for increasingly complex life and work environments in today’s world and those who are not. They include:

- Creativity and Innovation
- Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
- Communication and Collaboration

Today, we live in a technology and media-driven environment, marked by access to an abundance of information, rapid changes in technology tools and the ability to collaborate and make individual contributions on an unprecedented scale. Effective citizens and workers must be able to exhibit a range of functional and critical thinking skills, such as:

- Information Literacy
- Media Literacy
- ICT (Information, Communications and Technology) Literacy

All participants shared the belief that the Q4i project with its manifesto corresponds to the latest trends but especially to the needs of teachers, students and the learning community in Europe. They, further, expressed their strong interest in following the work done in Q4i and contributing to the development of the Q4i discussion.